

REMARKS

Claims 21, 24-27, 30, 32, 33, 39, 40, and 43-46 are pending in the application. Claims 21, 24, 26, 27, 30, 32, 33, 39, 40, and 43-46 are currently amended. No new matter has been added as the amendments have support in the specification as originally filed. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Claims 21, 24-27, 30, 32, 33, 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Runkis (US 2003/0046338). Claims 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Runkis and further in view of Delpuch et al. (US 2004/0139480). Claims 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Runkis and further in view of Weast (2004/0243694). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the following arguments.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Runkis

Claims 21, 24-27, 30, 32, 33, 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Runkis.

As amended, independent claim 21 recites obtaining state information from at least two services utilized in the playback of the content, the at least two services comprising a first service and a second service, wherein the state information comprises a first set of state values adjustable by the first service and a second set of state values adjustable by the second service, the first set of state values associated with data flow control of the content and the second set of state values associated with display characteristics and audio characteristics for outputting the content, and wherein the second set of state values further comprise a value associated with the volume for the playback of the content.

Page 4 of the Office Action states that paragraph 78 of Runkis discloses “obtaining state information from at least two services utilized in the playback of the content, the at least two

services comprising an AV transport service and a Rendering Control Service.” Specifically, the Office Action states that paragraph 78 of Runkis discloses “the user requesting to continue playback of a movie which includes the rendering state of where the user stopped watching previously and data content control of where to restart the audio and video playback content services.” Applicant provides the following remarks.

Paragraph 78 of Runkis discloses that “a transient user can start watching a feature movie in one service zone, e.g. on a flight from New York to Chicago, pause the movie when the plane arrives at the airport in Chicago, change planes, and continue watching the same movie, from the point that at which it was interrupted, on a different plane or even a different airline during the continuing flight, e.g. to San Francisco.”

A review of the passage above reveals that a user may pause the movie on one plane and restart the movie on a different plane, such that the movie begins at the point where the movie was paused on the first plane. However, Applicant submits that Runkis does not teach or suggest that the “a second set of state values adjustable by the second service... and the second set of state values associated with display characteristics and audio characteristics for the outputting content, and wherein the second set of state values further comprise a value associated with the volume for the playback of the content,” as required by independent claim 21.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Runkis only teaches storing the position where the movie was paused to be later used in playback. Runkis is silent on disclosing storing display or audio characteristics for outputting the content. More specifically, Runkis does not disclose storing or adjusting any values associated with the volume of the stored content. At best, Runkis simply resumes playing the content from the last paused position. Moreover, Applicant has thoroughly reviewed Runkis and has found no discussion on adjusting the volume of the content. Thus, since Runkis is silent on storing display characteristics and audio characteristics, and more specifically “a value associated with the volume for the playback of the content,” Applicant submits that Runkis cannot teach or suggest “obtaining state information from at least two services utilized in the playback of the content, the at least two services comprising a first service and a second service, wherein the state information comprises a first set of state values adjustable by the first service and a second set of state values adjustable by the second service,

the first set of state values associated with data flow control of the content and the second set of state values associated with display characteristics and audio characteristics for outputting the content, and wherein the second set of state values further comprise a value associated with the volume for the playback of the content,” as recited in claim 21.

Applicant has demonstrated above that Runkis fails to teach or suggest various elements recited in independent claim 21. Therefore, independent claim 21 is allowable over the cited reference. Additionally, independent claim 26 recites elements similar to independent claim 21. Therefore, claim 26 should be allowable for the reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 21. Finally, claims 24, 25, 27, 30, 32, 33, 45 and 46 are allowable by virtue of their respective dependence on allowable independent claims 21 and 26.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Runkis and further
in view of Delpuch**

Claims 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Runkis and further in view of Delpuch.

Applicant has demonstrated above that Runkis fails to teach or suggest various elements recited in independent claims 21 and 26. Additionally, Applicant submits that Delpuch fails to cure the deficiencies of Runkis with respect to obtaining state information from at least two services utilized in the playback of the content, the at least two services comprising a first service and a second service, wherein the state information comprises a first set of state values adjustable by the first service and a second set of state values adjustable by the second service, the first set of state values associated with data flow control of the content and the second set of state values associated with display characteristics and audio characteristics for outputting the content, and wherein the second set of state values further comprise a value associated with the volume for the playback of the content. Therefore, independent claims 21 and 26 should still be allowable over the cited combination of references. Additionally, claims 39 and 40 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependence on allowable claims 21 and 26.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Runkis and further
in view of Weast**

Claims 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Runkis and further in view of Weast.

Applicant has demonstrated above that Runkis fails to teach or suggest various elements recited in independent claims 21 and 26. Additionally, Applicant submits that Weast fails to cure the deficiencies of Runkis with respect to obtaining state information from at least two services utilized in the playback of the content, the at least two services comprising a first service and a second service, wherein the state information comprises a first set of state values adjustable by the first service and a second set of state values adjustable by the second service, the first set of state values associated with data flow control of the content and the second set of state values associated with display characteristics and audio characteristics for outputting the content, and wherein the second set of state values further comprise a value associated with the volume for the playback of the content. Therefore, independent claims 21 and 26 should still be allowable over the cited combination of references. Additionally, claims 43 and 44 are allowable at least by virtue of their respective dependence on allowable claims 21 and 26.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present Amendment places all claims of the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned agent at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Waimey

Date: September 10, 2009

Customer No. 035884

By: /Harry S. Lee/
Harry S. Lee
Registration No. 59,657